

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
8 AT SEATTLE

9 KURT SINGLETON,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 INTELLISIST, INC., d/b/a Spoken  
Communications,

13 Defendants.  
14

Case No. C17-1712RSL


ORDER GRANTING MOTION  
FOR RECONSIDERATION

15 On November 13, 2017, the parties filed a “Stipulated Motion to File Complaint and  
16 Exhibits Under Seal.” Dkt. # 3. Pursuant to the procedure set forth in LCR 5(g), plaintiff filed  
17 the motion to seal only because the contracts between the parties designated certain information  
18 confidential. Because plaintiff did not argue that the information is confidential or that a seal is  
19 appropriate, the stipulation was noted on the Court’s calendar to give defendant a chance to  
20 “show that compelling reasons supported by specific factual findings outweigh the general  
21 history of access and the public policies favoring disclosure” of court records. Pintos v. Pac.  
22 Creditors Ass’n, 605 F.3d 665, 678 (9th Cir. 2010) (internal quotation marks and alterations  
23 omitted). On December 6, 2017, the Court denied the motion for seal on the ground that  
24 defendant made no effort to support the contention that sections of the complaint and exhibits  
25 should be redacted and kept confidential.  
26

ORDER GRANTING MOTION  
FOR RECONSIDERATION

1 The Court erred. Three documents were filed under seal on November 22, 2017, that were  
2 offered in support of the parties' stipulation. Having now reviewed those documents, defendant's  
3 motion for reconsideration (Dkt. 25) is GRANTED. The unredacted copy of the Complaint (Dkt.  
4 # 6) shall remain under seal. The Clerk is directed to unseal Exhibit 2 to the Complaint (Dkt.  
5 # 6-1).

6  
7 Dated this 11th day of December, 2017.

8 

9 Robert S. Lasnik  
10 United States District Judge  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26